

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in the case. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

The Examiner has required corrected drawings because Figures 2 and 3 are of poor reproducible quality. Formal drawings (Figures 1-4) are attached hereto.

Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated essentially that the terms "perspective" and "aspect" do not work to clearly point out and distinctly claims the invention.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The terms "perspective" and "aspect" are believed to be clear given the definitions provided in the specification, thus operating to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. For example, see Figures 1 and 2 and page 9, line 19 to page 10, line 10, where "an environment 102 may have several aspects 104-108. Aspects are represented by an activity map 110 and displayed in two or more linked or associated perspectives 112-114. A single perspective may incorporate more than one aspect. An aspect may be represented by more than one perspective." For example, "The upper part of the map 202 provides a geographic view of an environment: it shows how many participants from various regions are engaged (now and/or cumulatively). Thus, the single perspective 202 incorporates two aspects, a geographic aspect and a level of user participation aspect. The lower part of the map 204 provides a discussion view; it shows how many participants are in each of the twenty-one topics or themes (e.g., 206)" (see page 10, lines 3-10). For the foregoing reasons, the terms

“perspective” and “aspect” are believed to work to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12 and 15-18 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Liles et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,880,731). The Examiner stated essentially that Liles teaches all the limitations of claims 1-10, 12 and 15-18.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, “representing aspects in an activity map comprising at least two perspectives; and representing a state of a user within the environment as a tangible link between each perspective.” Claim 12 claims, *inter alia*, “representing the aspect in an activity map including at least two perspectives; representing an activity of a user within the environment; and representing the activity of the user as a tangible link between each perspective.”

Liles teaches an application for a graphic chat session including an animated gesture (see Abstract). Liles does not teach “representing aspects in an activity map comprising at least two perspectives” as claimed in claim 1 or “representing the aspect in an activity map including at least two perspectives” as claimed in claim 12. Liles teaches a chat window having animation and text portions (see Figure 13). Liles does not teach an activity map as claimed in claims 1 and 12. The application of Liles does not include a map of any kind, much less a map of activity including represented aspects of an environment, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 12. Therefore, Liles fails to teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 12.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 15-18 depend from claim 12. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 12. At least claims 6 and 16 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 6 and 16 claim, “wherein the tangible link is a line linking a user’s activity represented separately in the at least two perspectives of the activity map.” Liles teaches an application having separate panes for different views, e.g., a text view and an animated view of a chat session (see Figure 13). Liles does not teach an activity map, much less, a line linking a user’s activity represented separately in the at least two perspectives of the activity map, essentially as claimed in claims 6 and 16. Therefore, Liles fails to teach all the limitations of claims 6 and 16.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 13-14 and 19-22 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liles, as applied to claims 1 and 12, in view of Moncreiff (US Patent No. 6,061,716). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Liles and Moncreiff teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 11, 13-14 and 19-22.

Claim 19 claims, *inter alia*, “representing aspects in an activity map comprising at least two associated perspectives, wherein the perspectives are associated by a market participant; providing at least one perspective in which an on-line transaction is conducted between at least two market participants; and representing the market participants within the activity map.”

Liles teaches an application for a graphic chat session including an animated gesture (see Abstract). Liles does not teach or suggest “representing the market participants within the activity map” as claimed in claim 19. Liles teaches a chat window

having animation and text portions. Liles does not teach or suggest an activity map as claimed in claim 19. The application of Liles does not include a map of any kind, much less representing the market participants within the activity map, essentially as claimed in claim 19. Therefore, Liles fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 19.

Moncreiff teaches a chat room network, wherein conversation in each chat room is related to TV or radio programming (see Abstract). Moncreiff teaches a user can purchase program merchandise (see col. 6, lines 19-31). Moncreiff does not teach or suggest, “representing the market participants within the activity map” as claimed in claim 19. Moncreiff teaches a time zone selector, an area/carrier selector, a channel guide and a programming guide for searching for chat rooms (see Figures 6, 7, 9 and 9A). The selectors and guides of Moncreiff do not map activity, much less include a representation of market participants within an activity map, essentially as claimed in claim 19. Therefore, Moncreiff does not teach or suggest, “representing the market participants within the activity map” as claimed in claim 19. Therefore, Moncreiff fails to cure the deficiencies of Liles.

Accordingly, the combined teachings of Liles and Moncreiff fail to teach or suggest, “representing aspects in an activity map comprising at least two associated perspectives” as claimed in claim 19.

Claims 20-22 depend from claim 19. Claim 11 depends from claim 1. Claims 13-14 depend from claim 12. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. At least claim 21 is believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claim 21 claims, *inter alia*, “wherein the association between perspectives is represented as a tangible link connecting perspectives, wherein the tangible link is a line linking the market participants activity represented separately in the at least two perspectives of the activity map.”

Liles teaches an application having separate panes for different views, e.g., a text view and an animated view of a chat session (see Figure 13). Liles does not teach or suggest an activity map, much less, that a “tangible link is a line linking the market participants activity represented separately in the at least two perspectives of the activity map” as claimed in claim 21. Nowhere does Liles teach or suggest a line between the different panes. Therefore, Liles fails to teach all the limitations of claim 21.

Moncreiff teaches a variety of screens for determining programming (see Figures 6, 7, 9, and 9a). Moncreiff does not teach or suggest “a line linking the market participants activity represented separately in the at least two perspectives of the activity map” as claimed in claim 21. A line may not link the screens of Moncreiff because the screens appear in series at different times (see col. 4, lines 48-50). Therefore, Moncreiff fails to cure the deficiencies of Liles.

The combined teachings of Liles and Moncreiff fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 21.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1-22, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicants

**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889